Supplementary Materials for

Quantification of antiviral drug tenofovir (TFV) by surface enhanced Raman spectroscopy (SERS) using cumulative distribution functions (CDFs)

Marguerite R. Butler¹, Jana Hrncirova^{1,2}, Meredith Clark³, Sucharita Dutta³, John B. Cooper^{1*}

¹ Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529 USA

² Department of Physical and Macromolecular Chemistry, Charles University, Hlavova 2030, 128 40 Prague 2, Czech Republic

³ Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA 23507, USA

*Corresponding author John B. Cooper, jcooper@odu.edu

This file contains the following contents: Figure S1 – S5, Table S1



Fig. S1. Corrected UV- vis spectra of the Ag colloidal nanoparticle suspensions used in this study. These spectra were acquired using a Thermo Scientific Evolution 201 UV-Visible Spectrophotometer.



Fig. S2. SERS spectra from the **(A)** single deposition experiment and **(B)** double deposition experiment where each spectrum is an average of 100 spectra (20 spectra from each replicate). A 7- point Savitzsky- Golay smoothing function was applied. Spectra were offset for clarity.



Fig. S3. Histograms showing the Q_i distribution of all acquired spectra for each TFV concentration in the single deposition experiment. (A) 500 ng/mL; (B) 400 ng/mL; (C) 200 ng/mL; (D) 100 ng/mL; (E) 50 ng/mL; (F) 40 ng/mL; (G) 25 ng/mL; (H) Blank (Milli-Q H₂O). Zoomed insets of clustered data for each concentration are shown for clarity. Histograms were generated using 100 bins where the count of spectra in each bin was plotted as a function of Q_i whose width corresponds to the Q_i range of spectra in the bin.



Fig. S4. Histograms showing the Q_i distribution of all acquired spectra for each TFV concentration in the double deposition experiment. (A) 500 ng/mL; (B) 400 ng/mL; (C) 200 ng/mL; (D) 100 ng/mL; (E) 50 ng/mL; (F) 40 ng/mL; (G) 25 ng/mL; (H) Blank (Milli-Q H₂O). Zoomed insets of clustered data for each concentration are shown for clarity. Histograms were generated using 100 bins where the count of spectra in each bin was plotted as a function of Q_i whose width corresponds to the Q_i range of spectra in the bin.



Fig. S5. Unfitted CDFs of the (A) single deposition experiment and (B) probability range 0.85 - 0.95 zoomed in for clarity. (C) and (D) show this same analysis for the double deposition experiment.

| Table S1. Standard deviation (σ) of $\Sigma \triangle CDF$ values for each TFV concentration from the single |
|--|
| and double deposition datasets. The difference between the σ of the single deposition and double |
| deposition was calculated for each concentration, and averaged. |

| [TFV] (ng/mL) | σ single deposition | σ double deposition | σ difference (single - double) |
|---------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 500 | 0.1095 | 0.0646 | 0.0449 |
| 400 | 0.0759 | 0.0753 | 0.0006 |
| 200 | 0.1035 | 0.0789 | 0.0246 |
| 100 | 0.1363 | 0.0312 | 0.1051 |
| 50 | 0.0585 | 0.0783 | -0.0198 |
| 40 | 0.1224 | 0.0992 | 0.0233 |
| 25 | 0.0908 | 0.1250 | -0.0342 |
| | | Average σ difference | 0.0206 |